



Ad Hoc Joint City-Schools Facility Investment Task Force

Capital Planning and Implementation Subcommittee

Memo Outline – DRAFT

- I. Introduction & Overview
 - a. Focus / charge
 - b. Subcommittee members
 - c. Meetings (date and agenda topic)

- II. Executive Summary of Findings & Recommendations
 - a. Summary of Key Takeaways
 - b. Summary of Recommendations (may seem repetitive in this format, but used for broader Joint Task Force executive summary)

- III. Current State:
 - a. Current City process overview – CIP (Staff to provide input)
 - b. Current Schools process overview – CIP (Staff to provide input)
 - c. Current staffing structure (Staff to provide input)
 - i. DGS
 - ii. Schools – Facilities

- IV. Themes / Major Discussion Points (aka Sub-Committee’s Vision for Success):
 - a. Application of the framework and processes outlined in this memo should be **applied to the capital budget in its entirety**. The isolation of facilities is a false separation from all capital projects. While we recognize it will be challenging to implement a new framework as the City has committed funding to projects, we urge the City to endeavor to reach a steady-state utilizing this framework.

 - b. A comprehensive **culture shift** is required among leadership and staff that embraces:
 - i. A joint proactive and formalized planning process across City and Schools.
 - ii. A planning process that focuses on the delivery of services and capabilities rather than projects.
 - iii. Consistency, coherency, and comprehensiveness in capital planning that includes more discipline in the analysis of alternatives and project strategies.

 - c. Updated capital planning and implementation **processes** supporting this culture shift should be developed and implemented. A high-level framework is described herein, which will require additional consideration by staff to establish a process that determines the correct approach to deliver capabilities.

- i. Describe framework (capabilities service model)
 - 1. Identify needs and services
 - 2. Determine capabilities to support the need
 - 3. Evaluate alternatives
 - 4. Planning/design/execution
 - 5. How it aligns with CIP – connect to timing and appropriation of funding.
- ii. Include concrete examples of projects that illustrate the proposed process/framework.
- iii. The process should:
 - 1. Be traceable from concept to planning to design to execution and all stages in between.
 - 2. Outline planning and project decision rights and information flow should be transparent and clear. Decision rights are applicable to both capabilities and projects.
- d. Overall, these cultural and structural improvements to project planning should support an increase in a project’s level of ‘readiness’ for full funding and implementation, therefore setting up a project to be successfully delivered on schedule, on budget, and to the level of quality expected. The framework allows leaders and elected officials to make informed, and defensible decisions.
- e. In applying the framework, the City’s **engagement process** should be made explicitly part of the process.
- f. **Identification of a champion** to determine what ultimately is recommended to elected officials.

V. Actionable Recommendations

- a. Review the impact of implementing a Capability Delivery Model (framework) as described and presented by the subcommittee.
 - i. Identify methods to review capabilities
 - ii. As modeled in the FCIP, pursue funding plans that provide ‘seed money’ concept to support project strategy development and inform project assumptions
 - iii. Identify planning decision rights and work flows between staff and political leadership.
- b. City and Schools should pursue a **Joint Facilities Master Plan that:**
 - i. Reviews existing conditions and future state assumptions by:
 - 1. Reviewing and building upon previous departmental level efforts and studies (e.g. Fire Station Location Study, enrollment projections, etc.)
 - 2. Outlining needs for additional supporting data and studies

3. Reviewing and analyzing asset data such as the life spans of building systems (per M&O subcommittee)
- ii. Develops a new strategic vision for facilities across the City and Division by:
 1. Outlining a distilled strategic vision for facilities with clear and measureable objectives and that embodies the Capability Delivery Model
 2. Conducting a gap analysis of the new strategic vision against existing conditions so that the largest gaps can be identified
 3. Providing a framework for making decisions and engaging stakeholders
- iii. Synthesizes the understanding of existing conditions, future needs, and the distilled strategic vision to develop a road map that:
 1. Builds upon the FCIP planning strategies outlined by the Task Force by examining:
 - a. Addresses highest needs and biggest risks first
 - b. Optimal way to provide swing space needs
 - c. Optimal way to solve land needs
 2. Includes an outline of proposed facility projects concepts with key assumptions for scope, budget, and schedule and preferred CIP timeframe.
- c. Creation of a Joint Capital Management Council to provide leadership and ensure the capabilities service model (framework) is implemented by all entities.
 - i. Joint group to serve as peer review to ensure all projects have the appropriate level of rigor and have gone through the framework.
 - ii. Example compositions:
 1. City Manager, Deputy City Managers, Superintendent
 2. Representative from “sectors” (edu, health, infrastructure, etc.)
 - iii. Specify the stage(s) wherein this Council would make recommendation for a project to be placed in the CIP.
 - iv. How group would interact with (or replace) the current process for developing a CIP.
- d. Perform a review of **project implementation practices** similar to the effort conducted for the M&O subcommittee to better define areas for process improvement and organizational needs as well as inform the creation of a program management office (discussed in the following recommendation).
 - i. Conduct staff interviews and map out current implementation processes to understand areas for process improvement.
 - ii. Evaluate staff and resource needs for project execution and engagement.
 - iii. Review and illustrate current project execution decision rights and refine as appropriate.

- e. Identify an objective ‘program management office’ that **champions and facilitates** the distilled strategic vision, pursuit of joint planning, and the eventual implementation of the new Joint Facilities Master Plan in coordination with appropriate departments.
 - i. Specify the stages within the framework this office would manage.
 - ii. Construction arm for all capital projects “on behalf of the City.”
 - f. City and Schools should explore **decoupling** the annual capital and operating budget cycles so that:
 - i. Staff resources can be used effectively.
 - ii. The bandwidth of the political decisions is not overtaxed and capital projects can adequately reviewed and discussed.
 - iii. Related public engagement activities do not result in engagement fatigue and therefore dilute public participation levels.
 - g. Timing and appropriation of funding within the CIP.
 - i. Elliott to draft for review by Subcommittee.
 - ii. Funding in the CIP creates an expectation among staff and the community that a project will occur.
 - iii. How to budget and phase funding in the CIP as a capability becomes a project, is identified for alternative delivery, or determined to be an operational expense.
 - iv. Concept of undistributed capital.
 - 1. Near-term funding (Years 1 – 3) is more certain, mid-term funding (Years 4-6) is distributed as ROM, and late-term funding (Years 7+) is undistributed (or utilized for planning?).
 - v. Recognition that real estate and land acquisition costs are true capital.
- VI. Additional Considerations**
- a. Cost implications of recommendations – operating and capital
 - b. Timing and staging of recommendations
- VII. Exhibits (to be confirmed)**
- a. Doc and Data
 - b. Meeting Summaries
 - c. Capability Delivery Model (slides)